UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 5

IN THE MATTER OF:	)	
	)	
Chrome Tech of Wisconsin, Inc.	)	**FINDING OF VIOLATION**
Franklin, Wisconsin	)	**EPA-5-99-WI-31**
	)	
Proceedings Pursuant to the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 7401 et seq.	)	

Finding of Violation

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) hereby notifies the State of Wisconsin and Chrome Tech of Wisconsin, Inc. (Chrome Tech), that U.S. EPA finds that Chrome Tech, located at 10020 South 45th Street, Franklin, Wisconsin, is in violation of the Clean Air Act (Act), 42 U.S.C. §§ 7401 et seq. Chrome Tech is in violation of Section 112 of the Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7412, and regulations setting forth National Emission Standards for Chromium Emissions From Hard and Decorative Chromium Electroplating and Chromium Anodizing Tanks (Chrome Plating NESHAP), at 40 C.F.R. Part 63, Subpart N, as follows:

Regulatory Authority

1. The Chrome Plating NESHAP applies to each chromium electroplating or chromium anodizing tank at facilities performing hard chromium electroplating decorative chromium electroplating, or chromium anodizing.

2. The Chrome Plating NESHAP, at 40 C.F.R. § 63.342(f)(3)(i)(A), requires the owner or operator of an affected source to prepare an operation and maintenance plan (O & M plan), which specifies the operation and maintenance criteria for the affected source.

3. For sources using an add-on pollution control device or monitoring equipment to comply with the Chrome Plating NESHAP, the Chrome Plating NESHAP, at 40 C.F.R. §63.342(f)(3)(i)(B), requires the owner or operator of an affected source to prepare an O & M plan which incorporates the work practice standards for the applicable pollution control device or monitoring equipment,

as identified in Table 1 of §63.342.

4. The Chrome Plating NESHAP, at 40 C.F.R. §63.342(f)(3)(i)(D), requires the owner or operator of an affected source to prepare an O & M plan which specifies procedures to be followed to ensure that equipment or process malfunctions due to poor maintenance or other preventable conditions do not occur.

5. The Chrome Plating NESHAP, at 40 C.F.R. §63.342(f)(3)(i)(E), requires the owner or operator of an affected source to prepare an O & M plan which includes a systematic procedure for identifying malfunctions of process equipment, add-on pollution control devices, and process and control system monitoring equipment, and for implementing corrective actions to address malfunctions.

6. The Chrome Plating NESHAP, at 40 C.F.R. §63.343(c)(1), defines the compliant operating range for a composite mesh pad system as ±1 inch of water column of the pressure drop value established during the initial performance test, or the range of compliant values for pressure drop established during the performance test.

7. The Chrome Plating NESHAP, at 40 C.F.R. §63.343(c)(2)(i), requires the owner or operator of an affected source, or group of sources under common control, using a packed-bed scrubber system to comply with the emission limitations in §63.342, to establish the velocity pressure at the common inlet of the control device as a site-specific operating parameter.

8. The Chrome Plating NESHAP, at 40 C.F.R. §63.343(c)(2)(ii), requires the owner or operator of an affected source, or group of sources under common control, using a packed-bed scrubber system to comply with the emission limitations in §63.342, to monitor and record the velocity pressure at the inlet to the packed-bed scrubber once each day that any affected source is operating, on and after the date on which the initial performance test is required to be completed under §63.7.

9. The Chrome Plating NESHAP, at 40 C.F.R. §63.343(c)(5)(ii) states that if the owner or operator of an affected source uses a wetting agent to comply with the emission limitations in §63.342, then the operation of the affected source at a surface tension greater than the value established during the performance test shall constitute noncompliance with the standards.

10. The Chrome Plating NESHAP, at 40 C.F.R. §63.343(c)(5)(ii)(C) states that if the surface tension of the plating bath of an affected source using a wetting agent to comply with the emission limitations of §63.342 exceeds the established compliant value, then the original monitoring schedule of once every 4 hours must be resumed.

11. The Chrome Plating NESHAP, at 40 C.F.R. §63.347(h)(1) requires the owner or operator of an affected source that is located at an area source site to document the ongoing compliance status of the affected source.

Factual Background

12. Chrome Tech owns and operates a hard chrome plating facility located at 10020 South 54th Street, Franklin, Wisconsin.

13. Chrome Tech's hard chrome plating facility is subject to the Chrome Plating NESHAP at 40 C.F.R. Part 63, Subpart N.

Violations

14. On February 25, 1999, U.S. EPA conducted an inspection of the Chrome Tech facility.

15. During the February 25, 1999, inspection, Chrome Tech indicated that although it owns and operates seven hard chrome plating tanks, it has an O & M plan which applies to only one of the tanks.

16. Since Chrome Tech did not have an O & M plan which applies to all of its affected sources, then Chrome Tech is in violation of 40 C.F.R. §63.342(f)(3)(i)(A).

17. Upon review of the O & M plan for the Chrome Tech facility, U.S. EPA determined that the plan lacked the following: (1) certain work practice requirements listed in Table 1 of §63.342, (2) procedures for malfunction prevention, and (3) procedures for malfunction abatement.

18. Since Chrome Tech's O & M plan lacked certain work practice requirements listed in Table 1 of §63.342, then Chrome Tech is in violation of 40 C.F.R. §63.342(f)(3)(i)(B).

19. Since Chrome Tech's O & M plan lacked procedures for malfunction prevention, then Chrome Tech is in violation of 40 C.F.R. §63.342(f)(3)(i)(D).

20. Since Chrome Tech's O & M plan lacked procedures for malfunction abatement, then Chrome Tech is in violation of 40 C.F.R. §63.342(f)(3)(i)(E).

21. During the February 25, 1999, inspection, U.S. EPA obtained pressure drop records for Chrome Tech's Composite Mesh Pad System #2 (CMP #2).

22. The records for CMP #2 indicated that CMP #2 operated below the established compliant pressure drop range on February 25, 1999.

23. Since CMP #2 operated below the established pressure drop range on February 25, 1999, then Chrome Tech is in violation of 40 C.F.R. §63.343(c)(1).

24. During the February 25, 1999, inspection, Chrome Tech indicated that it had not installed a velocity pressure monitor at the inlet to its packed-bed scrubber system; therefore, a compliant velocity pressure range had not been established for the scrubber, and velocity pressure readings were not being taken for the scrubber.

25. Since Chrome Tech had not established a compliant velocity pressure range for its packed-bed scrubber system, then Chrome Tech is in violation of 40 C.F.R. §63.343(c)(2)(i).

26. Since Chrome Tech did not record velocity pressure measurements for its packed-bed scrubber system, then Chrome Tech is in violation of 40 C.F.R. §63.343(c)(2)(ii).

27. During the February 25, 1999, inspection, Chrome Tech submitted daily surface tension records used to track the compliance of one of its chrome plating tanks (Tank #7) from February 1, 1999 to February 25, 1999.

28. The surface tension records submitted by Chrome Tech indicated that Chrome Tech exceeded the established compliant value on 13 days.

29. Since Chrome Tech exceeded the established compliant surface tension value at Tank #7, then Chrome Tech is in violation of 40 C.F.R. §63.343(c)(5).

30. Since Chrome Tech did not revert to a 4 hour cycle in monitoring the surface tension of the chrome plating bath in Tank #7, then Chrome Tech is in violation of 40 C.F.R. §63.343(c)(5)(ii)(C).

31. During the February 25, 1999, inspection, Chrome Tech stated that it did not prepare an ongoing compliance status report.

32. Since Chrome Tech did not prepare an ongoing compliance status report, then Chrome Tech is in violation of 40 C.F.R. §63.347(h)(1).

6/29/99
Date

Margaret M. Guerriero, Acting
Director
Air and Radiation Division

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I, Shanee Rucker, certify that I sent a Finding of Violation by Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested, to:

Alan Henry, President
Chrome Tech of Wisconsin, Inc.
10020 South 45th Street
Franklin, Wisconsin 53132

I also certify that I sent copies of the Finding of Violation by first class mail to:

Bill Baumann, Chief-Combustion
Bureau of Air Management
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
101 South Webster Street
P.O. Box 7921 (AM/7)
Madison, Wisconsin 53707

Lakshmi Sridharan, Regional Leader
Southeast Region
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
2300 North Martin Luther King Jr. Drive
P.O. Box 12436
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53212

on the 29 day of June, 1999.

Shanee Rucker

Shanee Rucker, Secretary
AECAS, (MI/WI)

CERTIFIED MAIL RECEIPT NUMBER: P140 777016